

BT

215

①7



Hollinger Corp.
pH 8.5

BT 215

.D7

Copy 1

The Divinity of Christ

By the
Reverend Walter Drum, S. J.

LC

gl

The Divinity of Christ



One of a Series of Lectures on the Fundamentals
of Faith, delivered in the Brooklyn Academy
of Music, before the Brooklyn Institute
of Arts and Sciences, by

REV. WALTER DRUM, S. J.,

Professor of Scripture, Woodstock College

WOODSTOCK COLLEGE PRESS
MARYLAND
1917

BT 215
29

Imprimi potest:

A. J. MAAS, S.J.,

Praep. Prov.

30 Jan. 1917.

Imprimatur:

JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS,

Archbishop of Baltimore.

2 Febr. 1917.

Tenth Thousand.

Price, 5 cents apiece; \$3.00 the hundred.

JUN 13 1917

REFERRRED FROM

PUBLIC LIBRARY

JUN 27 1917

THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST.¹

Ladies and Gentlemen:

In our previous lectures, the subject was "The answer of the Protestant schools of Theology to the question 'What think ye of Christ'?" The question was put by our Blessed Saviour to the Pharisees. We have put that same question to the professors of the great universities and important seminaries, whom we have cited to you as members of the various schools of Christology. Few, very few of them give the answer of the traditional school. And so we may rightly call this answer, the answer of the Catholic school of Theology, the answer of the school of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Understand me, the Protestant laity still cling to belief in the Divinity of Christ. And there are ministers of the gospel, in the Protestant sects, who still teach the Divinity of Christ. But in the great universities, in the Protestant faculties of the seminaries and universities of note, in Germany, England and the United States, the Divinity of Christ is no longer taught. Against these

¹ One of a series of lectures on the fundamentals of faith, delivered in the Brooklyn Academy of Music, Dec. 1915, before the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, by Rev. Walter Drum, S. J., Professor of Scripture, Woodstock College.

men has my invective been, and not against those who belong to the traditional school of Christology.

I. Early Heresies.

The answer of the traditional school is this: "What think ye of Christ? He is very God and very Man." This answer was first called forth by the infallible declaration of the Church in the Council of Nicaea, 325 of our era. Arius had set the heresy agog that there was in Christ a person whose nature was human,—at any rate was not Divine,—was at most a halfway between the human and the Divine. This heresy was condemned by the infallible declaration of the Church in the Council of Nicaea, which defined the Divinity of the single person of Christ, and his twofold nature.

Later Nestorius started a new form of heresy. He taught that, in Jesus, there was the human person, and therefore a human nature; and also a Divine person with a Divine nature. This heresy was condemned by the infallible Church, which in the Council of Ephesus (431 A. D.) defined the oneness and Divinity of the single person, Jesus the Christ; and the physical unity in this Divine Person, of the double nature, human and Divine, of the Word made Flesh.

Later another heresy took rise. By the anathema of Nicaea, the Church had made it impossible

to teach, in the sense of Arius, that in Jesus there is no Divine Person and no Divine nature. In Ephesus, the Church had condemned the opinion of Nestorius that in Jesus there are two persons and two natures. Was there room for more heresy? Yes, Eutyches saw a loophole. He taught that in Jesus there is only one person, the Divine, and only one nature, the Divine. Against him the infallible Council of Chalcedon (451 A. D.) launched her anathema. The Council defined still more clearly that, in Jesus, there are two distinct natures, the Divine and the human, physically united in one Divine Person, and yet not merged into one nature.

What more? Since the two natures of Jesus were physically united in one Divine Person, what handle for heresy remained? One handle more! Three of the Oriental patriarchs,—Sergius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, Cyrus, the Patriarch of Alexandria, and Athanasius, the Patriarch of Antioch,—joined their patriarchal power in one last effort of the erring Orient to destroy the great mystery of faith. They had to admit with Nicaea, Ephesus and Chalcedon, that one Divine Person, Jesus the Christ, had two natures, the Divine and the human, physically united in one hypostasis or person. But they resented the mystery of a perfect man who was not a human person. They withdrew from the perfection of the human nature of Jesus. They taught that in Jesus

there was no human activity ; that the activity of the human nature was merged into the activity of the Divine ; that, in Jesus, there was only the activity of the Divine nature ; that, in Jesus, there was only one activity and one will, and that activity and that one will were Divine. Against this heresy, the Council of Constantinople (680 A. D.) defined the perfection of the human nature of Christ, His perfect human will distinct from the Divine, His perfect human activity distinct from the Divine.

One more effort was made by the Orient to degrade the God-man, from the perfection of His two natures. That was the heresy which split the Church in twain. In the ninth century, Photius denied to the Son equality with the Father in the procession of the Holy Spirit. He was condemned. The Church infallibly taught the equality of Father and Son, the procession of the Holy Spirit from Father and Son as from one principle. A schism resulted. The tear was mended for a century and a half. Then, in the middle of the eleventh century, under the Emperor Michael Caerularius, the party of Photius gained power again. Constantinople was wrenched from Rome. Since that time, the East has drifted on and on. But Rome has been absolutely firm and true to the Divinity of the Christ, to the perfect equality of the Son and the Father, to the perfect humanity

united with Divinity in the one Divine Person, Jesus the Christ.

Since the great schism of the East, the way has been clear in the Catholic Church. We have ever believed, as we believe and teach to-day, in one Lord, one Divine Person, Jesus the Christ, whose human nature is perfect and whose Divine nature is perfect. That, in brief, is the answer of the traditional school.

II. Proof.

Immediately there occurs the question, "Father, why do you believe in the Divinity of Christ?" "I believe in the Divinity of Christ on the authority of God revealing." "But you just told us that it was the Council of Nicaea, the Council of Ephesus, the Council of Chalcedon, that was the motive of belief." "I did not."

First Step.

The motive of Divine faith is only one. The motive of Divine faith is only the authority of God revealing. On the authority of man you have no Divine faith. Infallible though the authority of the Catholic Church be in the teaching of faith and morals, it is not the motive of Divine faith. Only Divine authority can be the motive of Divine Faith. Only on Divine authority do we believe in the Divinity of Christ. There is the first step. We believe in the Divinity of Christ, because God reveals that truth to us.

Second Step.

"But how do you know that God reveals to us the Divinity of Christ?" "I know that God reveals the Divinity of Christ, because the Church teaches me that God reveals the Divinity of Christ."

Third Step.

"But, Father, the Church may err when she teaches that God reveals the Divinity of Christ." I answer: "The Church may not err in faith and morals; because she is infallible in faith and morals." There are the three steps we take in answering fully the question, "What think ye of Christ"?

"What think I of Christ?" "I believe He is God, on the authority of God revealing." "How do I know that the authority of God revealing teaches me the Divinity of Christ?" "Because the Catholic Church tells me so." "How do I know that the Catholic Church is right in telling me so?" "Because she is infallible in faith and morals." So the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ comes down to the question of the infallibility of the Catholic Church. It will be necessary then, in order to complete our series of conferences on the Christ, to prove to you the infallibility of the Church as our rule of faith.

III. The Infallibility of the Church.

We have seen the actual results of the Protestant rule of faith; the various schools of Christology, in the great universities and seminaries of the sects, have given up belief in the Divinity of Christ. The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible,—with no support or stay, dangling in the air,—is no rule of faith whatsoever. For a rule is fixed in its measure; and the unsupported Bible is made by Protestant Biblical scholars to be adaptable to any measure you please. The unsupported Bible of Protestant theologians is claimed as their support for the most blasphemous, contraband, and contradictory theories in regard to the Christ. Among Catholic theologians, things are altogether different. The infallible Church is a fixed rule of faith. It has resulted, down the centuries, in a oneness of teaching in regard to the Divinity of Christ. How then do we establish the infallibility of the Church without the Bible?

No Bible.

Because in this stage of our apologetic we have no Bible. The Bible, the collection of books which Luther set up as the be all and end all of the teachings of Christ, the sole depository of revealed truth,—this Bible was not in existence until the year 220 of our era. True, the separate books existed before that time. But the separate, dis-

united books were not the Bible, until some authority outside of each book brought them all together into one authoritative collection. Moreover, the separated and disunited books did not exist until after the Church began to be. The Church began to be during the lifetime of Christ ; it was completed in its foundation by the time of His Ascension,—about 29 A. D. The Gospel of Matthew did not exist before 45 A. D. And the Gospel of John is assigned by such leading Protestants as Harnack of Berlin and Sanday of Oxford, to the period from 100-110 A. D. It is clear, then, that in this stage of our apologetic,—i.e., before we have the Church,— there is no Bible on which to found our acceptance of the Divinity of Christ. Unless the Church give me the Bible, and tell me that the Bible teaches the Divinity of Christ, I have no proof on which to ground my faith in this fundamental doctrine. How, then, do we establish the infallibility of the Church in her teaching of the Divinity of Christ?

Only Historical Evidence.

We start with four documents. They are called Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. We do not assume these documents as part of the Bible ; there is yet no Bible. We do not give to these documents any Divine authority. We merely prove that these four works are historical documents,—worthy of acceptance by a prudent man as narra-

tives of fact, and not of fiction. That is the start of our Catholic apologetic.

Now mind, I do not mean to say that this is the only proof of the infallibility of the Church. I mean to say that it is a proof which is very much used in the Catholic schools. It is a proof which holds to-day. In the early church, there was no such proof. In the early church, there were the miracles of our Saviour, the miracles of the Apostles, and the results of these miracles. Not so to-day!

To-day we start with four little books,—not with a Divine Book, but with human documents. We have no Divine Book until the Church gives it to us; and we have not yet the Church. We treat Matthew, Mark, Luke and John as historical documents. As historical documents they are worth more,—at least, are they worth as much, as any historical documents of their time. Let me prove that to you.

In the School of Historical Evidence, we gauge the historical worth of a document, first, by text evidence; secondly, by the evidence of versions; and thirdly, by the evidence of use in other trustworthy sources. Rated by these three standards, the four documents in question have an historical worth that is past all telling,—especially if contrasted with any contemporaneous, profane literature.

Ist. Text Evidence.

Our four documents are backed up by manuscript evidence, which is overwhelmingly more effective and weighty than is the manuscript evidence of any historical profane document of the time. We have 2,467 Greek manuscripts of the original text of these four documents, which trace the text back to about A. D. 350. At that time the manuscripts called the Sinaitic and the Vatican are admitted by all critics to have been written. The evidence of these 2,467 Greek manuscripts shows us with historic certainty, that our documents have been accepted and respected as historical down the ages; and have been substantially the same since A. D. 350, that is, since 240 years after John wrote.

Thus far we have cited the evidence of the great, complete,—substantially complete,—manuscripts of the four documents,—Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. We might add the weighty evidence of the fragments of John in the Archduke Rainer collection of papyri in Vienna. I have examined these fragments. Students of epigraphy,—the science of ancient scripts,—agree that these selections from John cannot be assigned to a date later than the beginning of the 3rd century,—i.e., to about ninety years after the death of John. Still, these early portions of the Gospels are *fragments*. So we waive them. We

are arguing not from any fragmentary evidence ; but from historical evidence of our four documents substantially as they are in our original Greek text of to-day.

If we compare these two wonderful manuscripts, the Sinaitic and the Vatican of about A. D. 350, we find that, although they substantially agree, still there are minor differences which cannot have taken place in less than a generation,—say thirty years. The text of the four Gospels, we know from history, was so respected, that we must allow, at the very least, thirty years for the changes and vicissitudes that led up to the accidental differences noted in the Sinaitic and Vatican codices. They therefore point to an archetype Greek original text that cannot have been later than A. D. 320.

Thus far, then, merely by considering our 2,467 Greek manuscripts of the four documents, we find them admitted as of historical worth from A. D. 320 until to-day. Let us now turn to the versions. They give us an historical evidence which brings us back with certainty to a text even earlier than A. D. 320.

2nd. Evidence of Versions.

We have more than 8,000 Latin manuscripts, which bring us down to a version of these four documents made by St. Jerome in A. D. 383. This version of St. Jerome was a revision of the

Old Latin version; and the Old Latin version was carefully used by St. Cyprian in the middle of the third century, by Tertullian in A. D. 181-189, by the Scillitan martyrs of Carthage in A. D. 180. This use of the Old Latin by these early Fathers, together with twenty-six manuscripts we have of the Old Latin version, force critics to admit that this version was made about 150 of our era, that is to say, about 40 years after John died. And this most important second century text, bearing witness to a Greek text in use about forty years after the death of John, is substantially the same as is the Latin Vulgate of St. Jerome, witnessed to by more than 8,000 manuscripts. There are accidental variations in the readings of St. Jerome from the Old Latin readings; but the fundamental facts, and the important statements which we use in our apologetic, are all guaranteed by the overwhelming evidence of the two Latin versions,—they witness to the use of our four documents as historical from forty years after the death of John until to-day.

Now compare this second century text of the Latin Church with the fourth century text of the Byzantine Church.

By comparing the Greek manuscripts, which bring us down to within 210 years of John's death, with the Latin version, which brings us down to about 40 years after John's death, we find the text is substantially the same; and there are acci-

dental differences, pointing to an earlier archetype text. This brings us to about say fifteen years earlier,—that is to about 135 A. D.

Another important version makes our historical evidence even stronger. The Syrian church translated these four documents into Syriac about the year, 150 of our era. Critics all admit that from about 40 years after John died these documents were in Syriac translation, substantially as we find them in the Sinaitic manuscript called Aleph, and in the Vatican manuscript called B.

Now put these facts together. In A. D. 150, the Latin and the Syrian churches admitted our four documents to be historical; and had their own translation from the original Greek text. These two translations, made 40 years after the death of John, agree substantially. But they disagree in accidental matters, and show that they were made from archetype Greek manuscripts that disagreed in these accidentals. To explain the accidental differences between these Greek manuscripts, from which were translated the Old Latin and Old Syriac Versions, we must allow at least fifteen years. We now have a text of A. D. 135, we are thus within twenty-five years of John's death. But these two versions,—the Old Latin and Old Syriac,—which bring us to an historical text of A. D. 135, agree in many accidentals in which they disagree from the Greek

text Aleph B,—a text that we have tracked down to A. D. 320. Therefore, we must hold to an archetype Greek text at least fifteen years earlier than the previous text. We now have it that in A. D. 120, or ten years after the death of John, the text of the four Gospels was admitted to be historical by the Church substantially as that text now is.

3d. Evidence of Patristic Use.

The evidence of the manuscripts of the original text of these documents, and of the versions made therefrom by the Latin and Syriac Churches is enough fully to establish the fact that these documents have been received as historical, substantially as we have them to-day, from the days of their writing until now. It would take too long to give the third class of evidence of this historic acceptance. Suffice it to say that our three documents of Matthew, Mark and Luke are used as authoritative by St. Clement of Rome, A. D. 93-95; St. Ignatius of Antioch, A. D. 110-117; St. Polycarp of Smyrna, about A. D. 117. And witnesses of the historical worth of all four documents are St. Justin the Martyr, A. D. 138-145; St. Irenaeus, A. D. 180-189; Tatian's harmony in Syriac, A. D. 170; and a host of writers thereafter.

Contrast With Profane Documents.

Now lay that idea aside. Come to the profane works. Every man nowadays admits, as historical documents, the writings of Caesar, Livy, Thucydides, Demosthenes. The writings of Sophocles, Aeschylus, Plato, Euripides, Aristophanes are without any hesitation assigned to the times,—indeed, to the authors those writings are named after. What manuscript right have we to accept as authentic the writings of these Greek and Latin historians? What manuscripts testify to us that we do not err in regard to the works we assign to the time of,— indeed, to the very writers, Sophocles, Aeschylus, Aristophanes, Plato, Euripides? Here is an astounding comparison. We have of

Aeschylus, 50 manuscripts, all incomplete;
Sophocles, 100 manuscripts, of which only
seven are good;

Catullus, 3 manuscripts, all from a fourteenth
century archetype;

Euripides, Cicero, Virgil, several hundreds.

Over against these, set more than 12,000 manuscripts of the four Gospels, of which almost 2,500 are manuscripts of the original Greek,—all substantially in agreement.

Again, the very best manuscript authority for Euripides, is 1,600 years later than the author;

Sophocles, Aeschylus, Aristophanes and Thucydides,—1,400 years later;
Plato,—1,300 years later;
Demosthenes,—1,200 years later;
Lucretius,—1,000 years later;
Horace, 900 years later, &c., &c.

Over against these manuscripts, so many centuries later than the works, the authenticity of which they are our best guarantee,—set the manuscripts for our four documents. The Greek manuscripts bring us down to within 240 years of the works themselves. The translations bring us down to about 40 years from the works themselves. And if we compare the substantially identical versions of the Latin Church and the Syriac Church with these Greek manuscripts, we critically reach a text that existed about ten years after the writing of John's Gospel. The contrast between the manuscript evidence for profane works, and the manuscript evidence for our four documents is simply overwhelming.

Now no prudent man ever thinks of denying those profane works to the authors they are assigned to. No prudent man ever dares to deny the historical worth of the main outlines of the writings of Caesar, Livy and Demosthenes. Therefore, in the name of sanity and prudence, no man has the right to deny the historical worth in substance of these four documents. There is

the first step in our proof of the infallibility of the Church.

We establish these four documents as substantially historical. They are worthy of historical acceptance, else we have to throw over the substantial historicity of the writings of Caesar, Livy and Demosthenes. We have to say that all the profane writings of the time are forgeries, and not worthy of any historical credence.

Now what do we mean by historical credence? The historic worth of Caesar means this, that there was a Caesar, that he went to Gaul, that he fought the Gauls, that he fought the Aedui, and the Belgae and others. There is no need to believe him in little details. There is no need to believe him if you have a prudent reason to refuse belief, when he says: "Quorum fortissimi sunt Belgae,"—that, in his time, "the bravest of all were the Belgians." But in general, along the great lines, in the substance of his history, no prudent man can deny the historical worth of Caesar, *De Bello Gallico*; because it has been admitted for centuries by prudent people.

In like manner, indeed, a *fortiori*,—in a stronger manner, for greater reason,—no prudent man can deny the historic worth of these four documents in their substance, in their main outline. What then is the main outline of these four historical documents? To what chief historical facts

do they bear witness? What are those facts, which even the casual reader of these documents takes note of,—facts that he undoubtedly admits by his acceptance of the documents as historical?

Main Historical Facts Proved by These Documents.

First, there was an historical person named Jesus. He said he had a message from God the Father to give to all the world. This is evident.

Second, He prophesied His Resurrection; and appealed to the Resurrection in proof of the truth of His claim, that He was the Ambassador of God the Father, and that He had from God the Father a message for the world. This fact is clear to any reader of the documents.

Third, He arose from the dead to fulfill His prophecy in proof of the truth of His claim to the Divine Ambassadorship, to the message from the Father, and to the right to give that message to the world. This fact is denied only by those who start by throwing out of court miracles, prophecies and all the supernatural elements of religion. Without any proof, save their own inner consciousness, they cull from the documents those sayings of Jesus which have nothing to do with His mission and call them the Gospel; they carve out all the facts that have to do with the main purpose of our documents, and call these the evolution of the Christian conscience. If you

press them for a reason, none can they give unless that reason which Shakespeare makes one of the *Two Gentlemen of Verona* ungallantly to assign to a much abused half of the human race:

"I have no other but a woman's reason;
I think it so, because I think it so."²

To judge by attendance at church, women as a class have a much better reason, in matters of faith, the most important matters in the world, than have men as a class. But these higher critics,—they are the ones who, in matters of faith, have no reason at all. Their one canon of belief,—rather, of disbelief,—is simply this: "I think it so, because I think it so!" They call themselves *higher critics*, because, forsooth, they occupy a vantage ground of scientific outlook,—a higher place from which to judge,—than do the lower critics. These humbler critics have for nearly nineteen centuries striven to find out what the text of our documents really was; the higher critics now strive to find out, not what the original text of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John really was, but what it *might, could, would or should have been*, had they been the authors. They need the antitoxin treatment against insincerity of scientific conscience. Were they sincere, they would leave Christianity and become Buddhists,

² Act I, Scene 2.

Muhammedans or Christian Scientists,— they would be anything but Christless Christians. Waiving these garblers of the documents, and taking Matthew, Mark, Luke and John as the historical documents which we have demonstrated them to be, we say that the clearest fact they establish is the Resurrection of Jesus from the dead to fulfill His prophesy in proof of the truth of His claim to the Divine Ambassadorship, to a message from His Father, and to the right to give that message to the world.

Lastly, both before and after His Resurrection, Jesus consigned, He conveyed to others the same message which He had from God the Father, and the right to give that message to the world. He consigned that message unto a teaching body, which He said was Infallible, Indefectible, One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Petrine.

You notice, there is nothing about a Book in our apologetic. I have often told you, there was no Book until long after the consignment of the doctrines of Christ to a teaching body.

We shall now prove that Christ consigned to a body of living teachers the very same message which He had from God the Father; and gave to that living body of teachers the right to hand down His message to all the world; and made that teaching body to be Infallible, Indefectible, One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Petrine.

What now follows is not a full, scientific treatment of apologetic. Such scientific treatment would require hours of argumentation. And yet without hours of argumentation, you may grasp quite enough of our apologetic to convince a thinking man of the overwhelming logic of the Catholic position in the defense of the Divinity of Christ.

We go at once to our historical documents,—the source of our historical information in this matter. I translate from the original Greek of the documents.

There is no need to establish the fact that Jesus claimed to have a message from His Father. According to the witness of John alone, Jesus made this claim thirty-two times. He again and again insisted, "My teaching is not mine but His Who sent me."³ And it was this very same message that Jesus consigned to a living teaching body. "As the Father hath sent me, so I send you."⁴ This living teaching body He made to be Infallible, Indefectible, One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Petrine. How shall we establish these qualities that belong to the living teaching body which Jesus gave to the world?

The Teaching Body Infallible.

First, this teaching body is infallible; it cannot err in handing down the message of Jesus to the

³ John 7:16.

⁴ John 20:21.

world. To prove this essential attribute of Christ's teaching body, the following facts, given by Matthew and Mark, are of paramount importance:

1°. Just before His Ascension, Jesus appeared to the eleven apostles in Galilee and said to them:

"All power hath been given me in heaven and upon earth. Therefore go ye, make disciples of all nations, baptise them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And, lo, I am with you all days, even to the end of the world."⁵

2°. On the very point of ascending into heaven from Mt. Olivet, Jesus once again gave this solemn message to the same body of teachers:

"Go ye to all the world, preach the Gospel to all creation. He that believeth and is baptised, shall be saved. He that believeth not, shall be damned."⁶

From these historical incidents, related by our documents, we may deduce much of what we have undertaken to prove. Notice the solemnity of the scene. "All power hath been given me in heaven and upon earth." Something most important is to follow. The faith of the world will be put to the test. Therefore the world is told that "all power is Christ's." With this all-power, He pro-

⁵ Mt. 28:18-20. ⁶ Mk. 16:15-16.

ceeds to make His living body of teachers to be infallible.

The mission of this teaching body, as here given, is threefold. First, "make ye disciples of all nations"; secondly, "baptise them"; thirdly, after baptism, "teach them." What? Whatsoever they have a mind to? No, not by any means! "Teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." They are not to go beyond the range of His message to the world. And He, the Ambassador of the Father, will be ever at hand to prevent them from error. They will be infallible in this teaching. It is a deposit entrusted to them to have, and to hold and to hand down without error, to all nations even to the end of the world. "Lo, I am with you all days, even to the end of the world."

Moreover, Christ made acceptance of the message of that teaching body the condition of salvation; and rejection of that teaching body the condition of damnation. "He that believeth, shall be saved; He that believeth not, shall be damned." In view of His Divine Ambassadorship of the Father, He could not have given such extraordinary power to any body of teachers that was fallible. If that teaching body could err in handing down His message, denial of His message would be a condition of salvation; and acceptance of His message would be a condition of damnation. That

were impossible, unspeakable. For "as the Father hath sent me, so I send you." Therefore, He made that teaching body infallible.

This is a most momentous part of our apologetic. So I drive it home again. This ending of the sixteenth chapter of St. Mark deserves your closest attention. Jesus, the Divine Ambassador of the Father, made the teaching of that teaching body, with whose message He will be to the end of the world, the only condition of salvation. Hence that teaching body must be Infallible. He could not allow it to err! He could not do that, since His message was from the Father, and He had risen from the dead in proof of that message. We have established then, that that teaching body must be Infallible. It cannot err, because if it erred, according to Christ's word, the acceptance of its error would be an absolutely necessary condition of salvation,—"He that believeth shall be saved,"—and the denial of its error would be the condition of an inevitable damnation,—"he that believeth not, shall be damned!"

The Teaching Body Indefectible.

Second, as Divine Ambassador, Jesus made that teaching body to be Indefectible. It must exist to-day; it will exist forever. "Lo, I am with you all days even to the end of the world." Again, at Caesarea Philippi, Jesus asked His disciples: "Who do men say that the Son of Man is?"

Then it was that Peter made his great act of faith: "Thou are the Christ, the Son of the Living God!" The Christ made answer, "Thou art Peter; and upon this rock I shall build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it."⁷ The gates of Hell shall not prevail against that teaching body: it is Indefectible.

When Newman was a little boy, he said to his mother, "Mother, what Church is the oldest Church?" "Oh, the Roman Catholic Church is the oldest Church." "And why is the Roman Catholic Church not the true Church?" "Because it left the truth in the fifth century." "Oh then, mother, the gates of Hell prevailed against it, didn't they?"

The gates of Hell shall not prevail against that Church. If they did, the Divine Ambassador would be false in His message from God the Father. He cannot be false in this. The falsehood would be set to God's blame. There is no falsehood. The teaching body is Indefectible. It exists to-day!

Now let us come to the four qualities of the teaching body which we call *notes*. The qualities of which we have spoken, Infallibility and Indefectibility, are so essential, that they are called the *attributes* of this teaching body. The four remaining qualities we call *notes*,—marks that are the visible characteristics of this teaching body.

⁷ Matthew 16:18.

The Teaching Body One.

First it must be One. Christ did not say, "Go, follow Henry the Eighth, when he throws over the jurisdiction of the Pope"; and at the same time contradict Himself and say "Go, follow the Pope of Rome." That teaching body must be one in jurisdiction. Christ did not say "Follow the New York Presbytery; deny the Virgin birth of Jesus; deny the physical Resurrection of the Saviour"; and at the same time contradict Himself by saying: "Be a Catholic; believe in the Virgin birth and the Resurrection." That teaching body must be one in doctrine. Because its doctrine is the message from the Father unto Christ. "As the Father hath sent me, so I send you."⁸ Its doctrine is the message of Christ to the world. "All power is given to me in heaven and on earth. Therefore, go ye, make disciples of all nations . . . teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."⁹ Its doctrine is the condition of salvation. "He that believeth shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned."¹⁰ That doctrine must be one.

The Teaching Body Holy.

Second mark: That teaching body must be *Holy*. Because it is founded by Christ to teach His doctrines, and only His doctrines. These doc-

⁸ Jo. 20:21. ⁹ Matthew 28:18, 19. ¹⁰ Mark 16:16.

trines must be Holy. That teaching body cannot deny the miracles of the Lord, cannot degrade the Lord to the low grade of a dupe,—as do the Anglican clergyman Lake of Harvard, the Lutheran clergyman Schweitzer of Strassbourg, and others. Holiness must be the mark of that teaching body, with which is the holy Divine Ambassador “all days even till the end of the world.”

The Teaching Body Catholic.

Third mark: That teaching body must be *Catholic*. “Go teach *all nations!*” “I will be with you *all days!*” It is not founded in 1520 by Luther, for some Germans; not founded in 1534, by Henry VIII, for England; not founded in 1560, by John Knox, for Scotland; not founded in 1606, by John Smith, for scores of kinds of Baptists; not founded in 1739, by John Wesley, for scores of kinds of Methodists. No, ten thousand times, no! That teaching body is founded by Christ for all times and all nations. “Go, make ye disciples of *all nations!*” “I am with you *all days even to the end of the world.*” That teaching body is Catholic, Universal!

The Teaching Body Apostolic.

Fourth mark: That teaching body must be *Apostolic*, founded on the Apostles. Because those were the Apostles to whom the message was given by Jesus the Christ.

That teaching body must be Petrine,—founded on Peter. Now pay strict heed! This is a note of the teaching body, which supplements the mark of Apostolicity. The body of teachers, which was founded by Christ, to have and to hold and to hand down His teaching till the end of time, must be Petrine. It must be founded on Peter.

How do we prove that? At Caesarea Philippi, on the occasion we have just described, the Christ rewarded the faith of Simon, Son of John, by setting him as foundation stone to the Apostolic body of teachers: "Thou art Kefa." He did not say, "Thou art Peter." He said, "Thou art Kefa," which means a *rock*, "and upon this Kefa,—this rock,—I shall build my Church." We cannot understand the force of the Christ's meaning, in our English, "Thou are *Peter*, and upon this *rock* I shall build my Church." Clearer is the meaning in the Greek and Latin versions of St. Matthew 16:18. The Greek Matthew reads: "Thou art *Petros* and upon this *Petra* shall I build my Church." The Latin translation has it: "Thou are *Petrus* and upon this *Petra* shall I build my Church." French is the only one of our well known languages, that has preserved the same word to mean both *Peter* and *Rock*,—"Tu es Pierre, et sur cette pierre je bâtirai mon église." That is the only sane, germane interpretation of these words. The new name, Kefa,

given to Simon, meant Rock; for he was made to be the rock, on which this teaching body was builded by the Christ. Hence it is, we find in the Syriac translation, the Christian Aramaic, the words of Jesus are preserved: "Thou art Kefa, and upon this Kefa, shall I build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." That teaching body must be built on Kefa, on the Rock, on Peter, not on the Bible! There was no Bible to build on, until nearly 200 years later; and then that Bible was given out by the Petrine teaching body. That Apostolic body must be Petrine, else the Christ erred, when He said: "Thout art Kefa and upon this Kefa I shall build my Church."

Summary.

To sum up, then, the Divine Ambassador of God the Father, Jesus the Christ, has consigned to a living body of teachers that message which he received from the Heavenly Father. This living body of teachers He has made to have two essential attributes and four visible marks,—it must be Infallible and Indefectible,—One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic,—yea, Petrine.

Find That Teaching Body.

Now find that body of teachers. It is Indefectible! It must exist to-day! Is there any teaching body to-day that dares claim these essential attributes, and these four marks,—espe-

cially the last, the Petrine? As I said, I now say again, that teaching body must exist. It is Indefectible. It will exist until time is no more. Is there any teaching body that claims to be Indefectible, Infallible, One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, —even Petrine? There is only one Church that has ever dared, or will ever dare claim to be such; and that is the Catholic teaching body, the great force that to-day welds into one faith seventeen million out of forty-five million in the United States, who admit to the census taker that they have any religion whatsoever.

When I think of the great body of Protestant Professors of Scripture, Theology and Philosophy, teaching their vagaries in Harvard with Lake, Royce, Hocking; in Yale with Bacon; in the Union Theological Seminary, with the President Brown and the rest of the Professors; in the Baptist Chicago University with Burton, Smith and Foster; way out in California University with Gayley and the Moravian Badé; when I note with horror that the very leaders of Protestantism, in our great non-Catholic Universities and important Protestant seminaries everywhere (with very few exceptions) in the United States, have given up the Divinity of Christ; when I think of all the Lutheran faculties in Germany, all the Calvanistic faculties in Switzerland, gone hopelessly away, boastfully so, gone of set purpose away from the

Divinity of Christ; when I see Oxford and Cambridge with Chairs of Divinity filled by men who deny the Divinity of Christ,—men like Canon Sanday, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in Oxford, and Canon Inge, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in Cambridge; and contrast these men with our Catholic Professors, a picture occurs to my mind, which I saw in the National Gallery in London about ten years ago. It is entitled “The Unknown God” and is the work of a modern,—Götze.

The Christ is fast to a pillar, stripped, bleeding, crowned with thorns. On the pedestal of the pillar is the inscription “To the Unknown God,” “Ignoto Deo.”

The allusion is to St. Paul’s preaching on the Areopagus, the Acropolis of Athens. There he told the Athenians, they believed in an unknown God. From the worship of the Unknown God, Paul strove to lead the Athenians to believe in Jesus, the known God. Were St. Paul to come to the world to-day, the scene he would witness would be such as Götze has depicted.

The world passes by, and it has not a glance for the unknown God; it has washed its hands of the Christ, even as Pilate did long ago.

There is the sport, in his home spun plaid; a smile is on his face. He beams, as he reads the sporting extra. With his crop he slaps his

puttees, as he bowls along. He gloats over the victory of some favorite of the turf. He gleams; for he gleans by that victory! He does not look at the Christ. A horse is more to him than is the Christ! He has washed his hands of the unknown God!

There is the lady in her satins. By her side is the dandy. She flirts with a lorgnette; he fills a cigarette. He leers and lures and allures. She smiles and smirks and perks. Neither he nor she has a look for Christ. A lorgnette is more to her; a cigarette is more to him than is the Christ. They have washed their hands of the unknown God.

There goes the newsboy with his extra. There sits a forlorn, lovelorn woman, in rags and tatters, holding in her arms a sickly babe in less than rags and tatters. Neither has a look of trust or of faith in the Christ. Even they, that need Him so, have washed their hands of the unknown God.

And there struts the minister of the Gospel,—the type of our Protestant University professors of the Gospel,—there he struts. In his hands is a great big Book. With all the dignity and self-importance of his class, he walks along. His head is buried in the Book. His eyes are all for the Hebrew roots of the Book. He has no look of faith and worship for the Christ! Why, a Hebrew root is more to him than is Christ. He,

too, the minister of the gospel of Christ,—the Professor of Scripture,—the educator of ministers of the gospel of Christ, he, too,—God help us!—has washed his hands of the unknown God.

Oh, I thank God with all my soul that I belong to a church that is Indefectible, Infallible, tyrannical in its Infallibility and Indefectibility; and will never allow me to swerve one inch from the belief in Jesus, the Christ, very Man and very God, now and forever.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 027 261 243 2



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 027 261 243 2



Hollinger Corp.
pH 8.5